

**Remarks:**

Claims 1-9, 12, 13 and 16-25 are pending.

Applicants and the undersigned thank the examiner for the telephone interview of April 30, 2007, in which the outstanding office action and possible claim amendments to incorporate dosage ranges were discussed.

Claim 11 has been rewritten in independent form and is now presented as claim 1. In view thereof, claims 10 and 11 have been cancelled.

No issues of new matter should arise and entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

**I. Information Disclosure Statement**

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the IDS filed on October 17, 2006. As requested by the Examiner, page 1 of the IDS has been corrected to list the application number (10/687,706) and is being submitted concurrently herewith.

**II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-13 and 16-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Birch et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,627,191) in view of Cohn (U. S. Patent No. 4,868,179) and Chobanian et al (U. S. Patent No. 5,645,839).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and respectfully submit that the claimed invention is unobvious over the cited references and there is no motivation to combine the cited references to arrive at the presently claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest, or provide motivation to arrive at the presently claimed invention.

However, in order to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 11. Claims 10 and 11 have been cancelled. As discussed during the telephone interview, the Examiner had indicated in item 16 of the July 10, 2006 Office Action, claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten to include all the limitations of the

base claim.<sup>1</sup> Applicants respectfully submit that with these amendments, the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection is moot.

### III. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-9, 12, 13 and 16-25.

Examiner Srivastava is encouraged to contact the undersigned concerning any questions about the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



Belinda M. Lew, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 53,212

Dated: JUNE 20, 2007  
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP  
1875 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
Phone: 202-663-6029

---

<sup>1</sup> The examiner also indicated in item 16 of the July 10, 2006 Office Action that claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraph rejections set forth in that Action. However, Applicants assume that this statement was in error because there were no 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraph rejections set forth in the July 10, 2006 Office Action.